

to be the offspring of his original genius, though the project has been before Parliament now for forty years, and, at one time, was an incessant subject of discussion. Once more let us point the often-repeated but all-important moral: Such are the depths of shame and disaster to which the greatest of nations may be dragged down by Party. In the end, unless the nation has made up its mind to undergo dismemberment, it will be found necessary to look the facts in the face and treat rebellion as rebellion.

To all the outcries of Irish Nationalists about the tyranny of Great Britain in imposing the Viceroyalty, or Castle Rule as it is rhetorically called, on Ireland, the answer is short, simple and conclusive. Thirty-five years ago the House of Commons passed by a majority of four to one a Bill for the abolition of the Viceroyalty brought in by Lord John Russell; but the Bill was dropped after the second reading in consequence of the opposition of the Irish members and the measure was ultimately abandoned in deference, as was expressly stated by the Lord Lieutenant (Earl St. Germain), to the wishes of the Irish people. Great indignation meetings were held at Dublin, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin with a train of Aldermen presented himself at the Bar of the House of Commons with a petition against the Bill. Nor have the hundred representatives of Ireland in the House of Commons ever since that time exerted their influence to obtain a change which, as they well knew, would on their demand have been at once conceded by Parliament. Some effrontery surely is required, in face of these facts, to charge the English people with maintaining the Viceroyalty for the purpose of depriving the Irish of self-government. There is scarcely a more foundation for the complaint that the government of Ireland is a government of Englishmen, and the instrument of an alien domination. Englishmen are employed in the public service in Ireland, as numbers of Irishmen are employed in the public service in England, and as an Irishman is Viceroy of India. But "Philo-Celt" in *Macmillan* gives a long list of important places in the Irish administration which are held by Irishmen. The list includes the head of the Constabulary, the Vice-President of the Local Government Board, the Chairman and two Commissioners of the Board of Works, the head of the Prisons Board, the head of the Industrial Schools, the resident Commissioner of National Education, who is a zealous Catholic, and the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks, who sat in Parliament as a Home Ruler. "Philo-Celt" remarks that in the case of Mr. Burke, Irish nationality did not save an official from the knife of his countrymen. The truth is that British Ministers have always desired to find Irishmen for Irish appointments, and especially for the Chief Secretaryship. Nationality was the special recommendation in the cases of Mr. Chichester Fortescue and Lord Naas. But political feeling and religious animosity in Ireland have run so high that it was hardly possible to find a Chief Secretary of one party or sect who would not be utterly odious to the other. The Orangemen of Ulster are Irishmen, and about the most of Irishmen; yet a series of Orange Chief Secretaries would hardly have satisfied the Catholics. The Chancellor and all the Judges in Ireland are Irishmen, but this does not prevent the Judiciary from being vilified as an organ of tyranny and judicial murder. It is not redress of grievances or extension of self-government that is aimed at, but Separation.

A GREAT party organization when once established, and when it has drawn into it a multitude of special interests and personal ambitions, does not immediately collapse, although the original ground of its existence may be removed. The factions of Guelph and Ghibelin long survived the reason of their formation, and the same may be said of the parties created by the struggle between the Hanoverians and the Stuarts. In the mind of the inveterate partisan party completely supersedes the country, and zeal in the party cause is the only patriotism which he knows. We are not surprised, therefore, to find the Democratic and Republican Parties in the United States still fighting for a name, or rather for power and pelf. But their struggle has lost interest for every rational observer. The issues of the past upon which they have hitherto subsisted are respectively buried in the graves of Slavery and State Right. The living issues of the present day, Civil Service Reform and the Tariff, do not divide the two parties from each other; but interest each of them. In each there is a corrupt, in each a comparatively pure wing. Their platforms are purely artificial structures, put together for a coming election; mere vote-traps, devised by the politicians and intended to catch, by chimerical or hypocritical promises, the support of a number of special interests, especially of that growing object of political adulation, the "working man." They are extremely mischievous as appeals to class feeling and from their tendency to encourage among the people expectations of State-made happiness which can never be fulfilled. But otherwise they deserve the attention of no reasonable being. The sole object of real interest is the battle between the President and Corruption, and the one thing to be desired is that the Independents and

friends of Reform who support the President in his arduous struggle should, as far as possible, remain masters of the situation. From this point of view the victory of the Republicans in Ohio may probably be regarded on the whole as a favourable event. The Ohio Democracy belongs largely to the corrupt wing, and it is the pressure of the corrupt wing of his own party, led by Vice-President Hendricks, on the President that is the thing really to be feared.

THE indignant replies of King Thebaw to the demands of the Indian Government are quite in accord with the character of Burmese potentates. He is following closely in the steps of that King of Ava who in the last century concluded an official communication to Lord Hastings with the words: "We will come and destroy your country." Such off-hand presumptuousness is by no means a trait to be astonished at in the sovereign of a country inhabited, Marshman tells us, by "various tribes of barbarians," knowing nothing of anything beyond the limits of his own domains—often only of his own palace; seeing nothing but the gorgeous pageantry which on every side surrounds him; accustomed only to the adulation of subjects the highest of whom approach him in prostrate attitude: no wonder that Thebaw flatly refuses to say to a policy of accommodation, much less of concession. The matter of dispute between the Indian and Burmese Governments is the confiscation of the property of the Bombay and Burmah Trading Association by the King in default of payment of a really fraudulent claim. This is only one of a large number of overt acts of hostility to the British on the part of Burmah. There has ever been between these Governments a certain amount of friction induced solely by the arrogance of the Burmese King. The annexation of Burmah is spoken of as a solution of these difficulties. Arguments may be adduced on its behalf. English rule over Oriental nations has upon the whole had a salutary influence. The dominant power of justly exercised force the most independent of Indian princes recognize, with the result that the most unimportant member of the ruling nation is treated with respect—as if he bore in his own person, as it were, the concrete embodiment of strength united to justice. This is everywhere noticeable. However imposing the Durbar, the scarlet tunic of a British sergeant is provocative of more true respect in the Oriental mind than the bejewelled turban of one of their own Rajahs. This respect is not the outcome of intimidation. Only tyranny can conjoin with intimidation, and their offspring is fear, not reverence. British rule in India is to-day the reverse of tyrannical. This the Ilbert Bill will prove. Such being the results of our dominion over India, we may expect the same to follow were we to extend our sphere beyond British Burmah. Perhaps in Burmah proper the benefits accruing would be neither so patent nor so deep-seated as they are in India. The Malay tribes exhibit a greater independence of spirit than, at all events, the peoples of the Deccan. But that beneficial results to a certain extent would be the consequence of the subjugation of this magnificent ultra-Gangetic Province all will grant. The possibilities of opening up trade of a great variety of descriptions are enormous. The soil is exuberantly fertile and tilled with a minimum of labour. The means of transportation afforded by the numerous rivers are ample. These rivers abound with fish and could also be made the motive force of innumerable mills. The general features of the country invite the building of railways. The splendid forests abound in merchantable timber which the absence of snow would enable lumber merchants to handle by the "logging railroads" so much used by our neighbours across the boundary. The ports are already good and not few in number, and native labour is easily procurable—an advantage which perhaps the contiguity of China serves to enhance.

AN educational contemporary did us the honour the other day to desire that we would give our opinion on the vexed question of the text-books. Without going into the unpleasant intricacies of the present controversy we may say that, if the State is to take charge of these matters at all, we should, on the whole, be in favour of a uniform set of books furnished under the authority of the Government and subjected to periodical revision. The advantages of cheapness and the convenience would probably outweigh any refinements of excellence which might be lost through the absence of competition. But above all it is our strong conviction, and a conviction which is confirmed every day, that this and all the general questions relating to public education ought to be removed from the influence of political party and from the vortex of Party strife. A body like the Council of Instruction on its reformed footing was out of the range of Party and at the same time inaccessible to any corrupt solicitations. Ever since the regulation of the text-books has been in the hands of a Party Minister we have had an incessant wrangle, envenomed by the most injurious imputations, while amidst the din of political assault and defence the merits of the literary question have been lost. The relations of a Party Minister to publishers always have been, and always will be, an